



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/822,540 | 04/12/2004 | Aron D. Rosenberg | 04712/050002 | 1791 |
| 21559 | 7590 | | | |
| CLARK & ELBING LLP | | | | |
| 101 FEDERAL STREET | | | | |
| BOSTON, MA 02110 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| AZPURU, CARLOS A | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1615 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/22/2009 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentadministrator@clarkelbing.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/822,540

Applicant(s)

ROSENBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos A. Azpuru

Art Unit

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Carlos A. Azpuru.

(3) _____.

(2) Richard Armstrong.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was agreed that the original rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph cited in the action of 01/08/2009 had been overcome by adding original claim language to the specification. Concerning the concentration ranges, Mr Armstrong pointed to page 12 for the broad range of 10-70%. The species of 40% comes from Table II. Since Table II refers to this species as a fiber, the claim language setting out particles will be deleted.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Carlos A. Azpuru/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615